

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/525,269	02/22/2005	Daniel J. Arriola	62581A	4993	
109 7	590 03/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION			BROWN, JENNINE M		
P. O. BOX 196		ION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MIDLAND, M	II 48641-1967		1755		

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			у
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/525,269	ARRIOLA, ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennine M. Brown	1755	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Only be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the applicati	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
 Certified copies of the priority document 	nents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received in Ap	plication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•	eceived in this National Stage	
application from the International Bu	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.	
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of References Clied (FTO-692) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)) Paper No(s)	Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/2/05</u> .		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) .·	

Art Unit: 1755

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/2/2005 was considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 2 recites the

Application/Control Number: 10/525,269

Art Unit: 1755

broad recitation M is the Group 4 metal, and the claim also recites preferably hafnium which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson (US 6653417 B2).

Peterson discloses a process for preparing an interpolymer of ethylene and another C_3 - C_8 olefin (col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 13) which is contacted with a catalyst comprising a group 4 metal compound (zirconium – col. 12, l. 14-col. 14, l. 10).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1755

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boussie, et al. (US 6900321 B2).

See entire disclosure. Boussie, et al. disclose a process for preparing propylene and propylene by contact with

wherein the metals disclosed in contact with the bidentate ligand are zirconium and hafnium (col. 5, l. 16; col. 49, l. 50-col. 71, l. 50). Polymerization with ethylene/propylene is disclosed having from 0.2-30 weight % comonomer (col. 75, l. 23-col. 78, l. 59). The ligand disclosed above is almost identical to that of claim 3, except for the substituent on the phenyl ring. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add substitutents to any of the rings in the ligand above to provide sufficient differences in the catalyst which may provide new characteristics in the polymers produced therefrom as is disclosed by the variations of ligands in the instant specification.

Art Unit: 1755

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennine M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-1364. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 9:30 AM - 7:30 PM; Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jmb



2,6-dimethyl-*N*-((6-(naphthalen-1-yl)pyridin-2-yl)(phenanthren-9-yl)methyl)benzenamine